



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/772,035

02/03/2004

Michael K. Saltz

30014200-2046

3880

58328

7590

09/25/2008

SUN MICROSYSTEMS

C/O SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

P.O. BOX 061080

WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER

CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER

PARTHASARATHY, PRAMILA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2136

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Terminal Disclaimer

The terminal disclaimer filed on 9/12/2008 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration dates of Patents 6,418,444; 6,742,006 and copending application 10/743,929 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/12/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant primarily argues that prior art reference does not disclose "determining whether a security identification can be authenticated before it is presented to a firewall control block or Java™ compliant applet", however agrees that Montgomery teaches "authenticating a client at a server, which is behind a firewall". Examiner would first like to point out that the Applicant has NOT claimed "determining whether a security identification can be authenticated **before** it is presented to a firewall control block or Java™ compliant applet" (**emphasis** added) and in the event such an amendment to the claims were presented, Examiner would update the search to consider the newly presented different scope of the claim limitations.

As such, Montgomery teaches ""determining whether a security identification can be authenticated before it is presented to a firewall control block or Java™ compliant applet", as already agreed by the Applicant. Examiner suggests amending the claims.

/Pramila Parthasarathy/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2136
September 23, 2008